

REMARKS

Claims 19-32 are pending in the present application. Claims 25, 26 and 28 stand rejected, and Claims 27 and 29 are objected to. Claims 19-24 and 30-32 are allowed. By this paper, Claims 27 and 29 have been amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER & CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 19-24 and 30-32 were allowed, and the Examiner has indicated that Claims 27 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have rewritten Claims 27 and 29 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Applicants sincerely thank the Examiner for a thorough examination of the application and allowance of these claims.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 25, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmonds (U.S. Pat. No. 5,110,034) in view of Applicants' submitted prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 recites a method for attachment of an electrical lead wire to a surface element, which includes thermally spraying a contact material onto a surface

of the surface element to create a contact point and welding the lead wire to the contact point.

The Examiner has stated: “Simmonds discloses a method for attachment of an electrical lead wire comprising spraying a contact material onto a surface to create a contact point....” (Office Action mailed March 5, 2010, p. 2, lines 12-13) (emphasis added). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Simmonds fails to teach, suggest, or disclose such limitation in its written description or figures. The only embodiment that Simmonds discloses for depositing a material onto the pad is sputtering (Col. 1, lines 66-68; Col. 2, lines 45-59; Col. 2, line 68 – Col. 3, line 6.) Sputtering is “[t]he ejection of material from a solid or liquid surface following the impact of energetic ions, atoms, or molecules.” 17 McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science & Technology 279 (6th ed. 1987) (attached). Nowhere does Simmonds mention or show that the method could include spraying in addition to or instead of spraying.

The Examiner has further stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included thermally spraying as disclosed by Applicant in the method of Simmonds because, thermally spraying allows the contact point and lead wire to be connected more effectively. (Office Action mailed March 5, 2010, p. 2, lines 16-19). However, since Simmonds does not disclose spraying as discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that it would not have been obvious to include thermal spraying in place of Simmonds’ method, which does not include any kind of spraying.

Moreover, Simmonds teaches away from looking for a “more effective connection.” In fact, Simmonds teaches that sputtering provides the preferred tight adhesion: “In the preferred embodiment, layer 22 of approximately 300 nm (ranging

between 1 nm and 500 nm) is sputter deposited onto the foil to provide a tightly adhering interface of fresh superconductive niobium to enhance the cohesion of layer 21 of palladium thereto.” (Simmonds, Col. 2, line 67 – Col. 3, line 4.)

In addition, there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation in Simmonds or Applicants’ background section that thermal spraying would provide a “more effective connection” than sputtering. To the contrary, Simmonds teaches that sputtering would provide a tightly adhering interface that enhances cohesion, as explained above. Therefore, Simmonds teaches away from seeking out a more effective connection through another method.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to replace Simmonds’ sputtering with thermal spraying. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 25, and Claims 26 and 28 dependent therefrom, for at least these reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (734) 302-6022.

Respectfully submitted,

June 7, 2010

Date

/Bonnie R. Shaw/

Bonnie R. Shaw (Reg. No. 60,493)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
524 South Main Street, Suite 200
Ann Arbor, MI 48104